Attachment to Independent Case Review Report
For CDRU # 254A Case file # 95-271029.

Material Examiner: Malone (RQ)

Remarks:

Case resulted in guilty plea, no transcript.

INDEPENDENT CASE REVIEW REPORT

Independent Review conducted by: Steve Robertson

Area(s) of Expertise: Hair and Fiber

Review commenced at: 10:45 AM (Time), 11/14/00 (Date)

File #: 95-271029

Laboratory #(s): 60127078
60129010

Examiner(s) & Symbols

	Reviewed	Not Reviewed		Reviewed	Not Reviewed
RQ	X☐	☐		☐	☐
WP, VM	☐	X☐		☐	☐
	☐	☐		☐	☐

Materials Reviewed

Trial testimony transcript(s) of:

Testimony Date(s): Pages:

Laboratory Report(s):

Laboratory Number: 60127078 Date: May 14, 1986

Laboratory Number: 60129010 Date: March 11, 1986

Laboratory Number: Date:

Examiner Bench Notes of: RQ

Laboratory Number: 60127078
60129010

Initials:

Was any other material reviewed? X☐ Yes ☐ No

If yes, please identify and/or describe the material: Submitting agency letter of 1/20/86.

Results of Review

File #: 95-271029 Item or Specimen # Reviewed: Q13, K2

Review of Laboratory Report(s) and Bench Notes:

Note: Numbered comments are required below or on additional pages for any "No" or "Unable to Determine" Responses

1) Did the examiner perform the appropriate tests in a scientifically acceptable manner, based on the methods, protocols, and analytic techniques available **at the time of the original examination**(s)?
☐ Yes ☐ No ☐X Unable to Determine

2) Are the examination results set forth in the laboratory report(s) supported and adequately documented in the bench notes? ☐ Yes ☐X No ☐ Unable to Determine

Review of Testimony:

Note: Numbered comments are required below or on additional pages for any "No" or "Unable to Determine" Responses

☐X Transcript not available.

3) Testimony consistent with the laboratory report(s)? ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Unable to Determine

4) Testimony consistent with the bench notes? ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Unable to Determine

5) Testimony within bounds of examiner's expertise? ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Unable to Determine

Initials: Sam

Comments

(Set forth by above question #, if applicable.
Use "Additional Comments" Sheet, if needed)

File #: 95-271029

#1. It cannot be determined from the documentation if the tests were performed in a scientifically acceptable manner.

#2. The results are not adequately documented in the notes. The notes are not dated, are in pencil and not ink and use abbreviations that are difficult to interpret (such as "M- dk dist, lt dist, lt indist" and "cut-ssp" to describe some of the characteristics of the hair).

The characteristics of the victim's known head hair standard is not adequately described in the notes.

A verification of the hair comparison by a second, qualified hair examiner should have been obtained. The verification practice began in 1986, according to Doug Deedrick.

Review completed at: 11:15 AM (Time), 11 / 14 / 2000 (Date)

Total time spent conducting review (to nearest 1/4 hour): 0.5 hour

I hereby certify that I conducted this review in an independent, unbiased manner and that the results of my review are fully documented on this report consisting of a total of 3 pages.

Steve Robinson — 11-14-2000

(Signature) (Date)

Initials: SMR

Additional Comments
(Set forth by question #, if applicable)